



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/688,848	10/16/2000	Scott E. Andersen	16517.001/38-21(51463)B	1817

7590

07/13/2005

Lawrence M. Lavin, Jr.
Patent Department, E2NA
Monsanto Company
800 N. Lindbergh Boulevard
St. Louis, MO 63167

EXAMINER

SISSON, BRADLEY L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1634

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/688,848	Applicant(s) ANDERSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Bradley L. Sisson	Art Unit 1634	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 August 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 9-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 9-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification is objected to as documents have been improperly incorporated by reference. In particular, the specification states at numerous instances that the plethora of cited documents are "herein incorporated by reference." Such omnibus language fails to specify what specific information applicant seeks to incorporate by reference and similarly fails to teach with detailed particularity just where that specific information is to be found in each of the cited documents.

Attention is also directed to MPEP 608.01(p)I, which, in pertinent part, is reproduced below:

Mere reference to another application, patent, or publication is not an incorporation of anything therein into the application containing such reference for the purpose of the disclosure required by 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. *In re de Seversky*, 474 F.2d 671, 177 USPQ 144 (CCPA 1973). In addition to other requirements for an application, the referencing application should include an identification of the referenced patent, application, or publication. Particular attention should be directed to specific portions of the referenced document where the subject matter being incorporated may be found. (Emphasis added)

As set forth In *Ex parte* Raible, 8 USPQ2d 1707, (BPAI, 1998)

The examiner is of the opinion that the general incorporation by reference of the Bentley disclosure in appellant's specification is insufficient to support the specific disputed limitations of the present claims in the manner required by section 112 of the statute. We agree

* * *

We believe that the doctrine of incorporation by reference is of no avail to appellant in this regard since there is no specific indication in the instant specification of the particular features disclosed by Bentley which correspond to those intended for use in the here-claimed device; nor does the specification identify the specific portions of the patent which appellant may have intended to rely upon to supplement his disclosure. The purpose of incorporation by reference in an application of matter elsewhere written down is for economy, amplification, or clarity of exposition, by means of an incorporating

Art Unit: 1634

statement clearly identifying the subject matter which is incorporated and where it is to be found. In re de Seversky , 474 F.2d 671, 177 USPQ 144 , (CCPA 1973).

Accordingly, the cited documents are not considered to have been properly incorporated by reference and as such, have not been considered with any effect towards their fulfilling, either in part or in whole, the enablement, written description, or best mode requirements of 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Response to argument

3. At page 8 of the response of 15 August 2003, hereinafter the response, applicant's representative asserts that the current title, Nucleic acid Acids Molecules and Other Molecules Associated with Plants" is sufficiently descriptive and that the objection should be withdrawn.
4. The above argument has not been found persuasive, as the claims are not drawn to "other molecules," or even to any form of nucleic acids that are found in plants generally. Rather, the claims are all drawn to nucleic acids that encode a lily protein. Therefore, and in the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary, the objection is maintained.

35 U.S.C. 101/112 Utility Rejections

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Art Unit: 1634

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Definitions: [from REVISED INTERIM UTILITY GUIDELINES TRAINING MATERIALS;
repeated from <http://www.uspto.gov/web/menu/utility.pdf>]

"Credible Utility" - Where an applicant has specifically asserted that an invention has a particular utility, that assertion cannot simply be dismissed by Office personnel as being "wrong". Rather, Office personnel must determine if the assertion of utility is credible (i.e., whether the assertion of utility is believable to a person of ordinary skill in the art based on the totality of evidence and reasoning provided). An assertion is credible unless (A) the logic underlying the assertion is seriously flawed, or (B) the facts upon which the assertion is based is inconsistent with the logic underlying the assertion. Credibility as used in this context refers to the reliability of the statement based on the logic and facts that are offered by the applicant to support the assertion of utility. A *credible* utility is assessed from the standpoint of whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would accept that the recited or disclosed invention is currently available for such use. For example, no perpetual motion machines would be considered to be currently available. However, nucleic acids could be used as probes, chromosome markers, or forensic or diagnostic markers. Therefore, the credibility of such an assertion would not be questioned, although such a use might fail the *specific* and *substantial* tests (see below).

"Specific Utility" - A utility that is *specific* to the subject matter claimed. This contrasts with a *general* utility that would be applicable to the broad class of the invention. For example, a claim to a polynucleotide whose use is disclosed simply as a "gene probe" or "chromosome marker" would not be considered to be *specific* in the absence of a disclosure of a specific DNA target. Similarly, a general statement of diagnostic utility, such as diagnosing an unspecified disease, would ordinarily be insufficient absent a disclosure of what condition can be diagnosed.

"Substantial utility" - a utility that defines a "real world" use. Utilities that require or constitute carrying out further research to identify or reasonably confirm a "real world" context of use are not substantial utilities. For example, both a therapeutic method of treating a known or newly discovered disease and an assay method for identifying compounds that themselves have a "substantial utility" define a "real world" context of use. An assay that measures the presence of a material, which has a stated correlation to a predisposition to the onset of a particular disease condition, would also define a "real world" context of use in identifying potential candidates for preventive measures or further monitoring. On the other hand, the following are examples of situations that require or constitute carrying out further research to identify or reasonably confirm a "real world" context of use and, therefore, do not define "substantial utilities":

Art Unit: 1634

A. Basic research such as studying the properties of the claimed product itself or the mechanisms in which the material is involved.

B. A method of treating an unspecified disease or condition. (Note, this is in contrast to the general rule that treatments of specific diseases or conditions meet the criteria of 35 U.S.C. 101.)

C. A Method of assaying for or identifying a material that itself has no "specific and/or substantial utility".

D. A method of making a material that itself has no specific, substantial, and credible utility.

E. A claim to an intermediate product for use in making a final product that has no specific, substantial, and credible utility.

Note that "throw away" utilities do not meet the tests for a *specific* or *substantial* utility. For example, using transgenic mice as snake food is a utility that is neither specific (all mice could function as snake food) nor substantial (using a mouse costing tens of thousands of dollars to produce as snake food is not a "real world" context of use). Similarly, use of any protein as an animal food supplement or a shampoo ingredient are "throw away" utilities that would not pass muster as specific or substantial utilities under 35 U.S.C. ' 101. This analysis should, of course, be tempered by consideration of the context and nature of the invention. For example, if a transgenic mouse was generated with the specific provision of an enhanced nutrient profile, and disclosed for use as an animal food, then the test for specific and substantial *asserted* utility would be considered to be met.

"Well established utility" - a specific, substantial, and credible utility which is well known, immediately apparent, or implied by the specification's disclosure of the properties of a material, alone or taken with the knowledge of one skilled in the art. "Well established utility" does not encompass any "throw away" utility that one can dream up for an invention or a nonspecific utility that would apply to virtually every member of a general class of materials, such as proteins or DNA. If this is the case, any product or apparatus, including perpetual motion machines, would have a "well established utility" as landfill, an amusement device, a toy, or a paper weight; any carbon containing molecule would have a "well established utility" as a fuel since it can be burned; any protein would have well established utility as a protein supplement for animal food. This is not the intention of the statute.

7. See also the MPEP at 2107 - 2107.02.

8. Claims 1 and 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility due to its not being supported by either specific and/or substantial utility or a well established utility.

Art Unit: 1634

9. The claimed nucleic acid and/or protein compound(s) is (are) not supported by a specific asserted utility because the disclosed use(s) of the nucleic acid(s) and/or protein(s) is (are) not specific and is (are) generally applicable to any nucleic acid and/or protein. The specification states that the nucleic acid compounds may be useful as probes for assisting in the isolation of full-length cDNAs or genes which would be used to make protein and optionally further usage to make the corresponding antibodies, gene mapping, isolation of homologous sequences, detection of gene expression such as in Northern blot analysis, molecular weight markers, chromosomal markers, and for numerous other generic genetic engineering usages. Similarly, protein may be used for detection of expression, antibody production, Western blots, etc. These are non-specific uses that are applicable to nucleic acid(s) and/or proteins in general and not particular or specific to the nucleic acid(s) and/or protein(s) being claimed.

10. Further, the claimed nucleic acid and/or protein compound(s) is (are) not supported by a substantial utility because no substantial utility has been established for the claimed subject matter. For example, a nucleic acid may be utilized to obtain a protein. The protein could then be used in conducting research to functionally characterize the protein. The need for such research clearly indicates that the protein and/or its function is not disclosed as to a currently available or substantial utility. A starting material that can only be used to produce a final product does not have substantial asserted utility in those instances where the final product is not supported by a specific and substantial utility. In this case none of the proteins that are to be produced as final products resulting from processes involving claimed nucleic acid have asserted or identified specific and substantial utilities. The research contemplated by applicant(s) to characterize potential protein products, especially their biological activities, does not constitute a

Art Unit: 1634

specific and substantial utility. Identifying and studying the properties of a protein itself or the mechanisms in which the protein is involved does not define a "real world" context or use.

Similarly, the other listed and asserted utilities as summarized above or in the instant specification are neither substantial nor specific due to being generic in nature and applicable to a myriad of such compounds. Note, because the claimed invention is not supported by a specific and substantial asserted utility for the reasons set forth above, credibility has not been assessed. Neither the specification as filed nor any art of record discloses or suggests any property or activity for the nucleic acid and/or protein compound(s) such that another non-asserted utility would be well established for the compounds.

11. Claims 1 and 9-15 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art would not know how to use the claimed invention.

Response to argument

12. At pages 9-11 of the response applicant's representative presents argument that the rejection should be withdrawn as the specification, at page 24, provides 'Uses of the Agents of the Invention.'

13. For convenience, the passage found at page 24, bridging to page 26, is reproduced below.

Art Unit: 1634

limited to, genes that are involved in reproduction, female production and development. The ESTs of the present invention will find great use in the isolation of a variety of agronomically significant genes, including but not limited to, non-regulatory genes and genes that regulate microsporogenesis, meiosis, cell cycle, signal transduction, cell-cell communication, carotenoids, floral biogenesis, embryogenesis, protein, amino acids, sterols, oils, minerals, isoflavones, saponins, vitamins, tocopherols, antinutrient components, carbohydrates, and starch metabolism. Such genes are associated with plant growth, quality, yield, and could also serve as links in important developmental, metabolic, and catabolic pathways. The ESTs of the present invention also can enable the acquisition of female-specific promoters and cis-regulatory elements which will be useful to express agronomically significant genes in these tissues and/or other tissues. The ESTs of the present invention also can enable the acquisition of molecular markers, which can be used in, including but not limited to, breeding schemes, genetic and molecular mapping, and cloning of agronomically significant genes. Libraries from this tissue can enable the acquisition of a variety of agronomically significant genes involved in the synthesis and catabolism of commercially important traits.

The nucleic acid molecules and fragments thereof of the present invention from the subtractive cDNA library LIB3230 are isolated from late lily ovule tissue harvested from plants at the mitotic to mature ovule stage. Libraries from this tissue can enable acquisition of, including but not limited to, genes that are involved in reproduction, female production and development. The ESTs of the present invention will find great use in the isolation of a variety of agronomically significant genes, including but not limited to, non-regulatory genes and genes that regulate microsporogenesis, meiosis, cell cycle, signal transduction, cell-cell communication, carotenoids, floral biogenesis, embryogenesis, protein, amino acids, sterols, oils, minerals, isoflavones, saponins, vitamins, tocopherols, antinutrient components, carbohydrates, and starch metabolism. Such genes are associated with plant growth, quality, yield, and could also serve as links in important developmental, metabolic, and catabolic pathways. The ESTs of the present invention also can enable the acquisition of female-specific promoters and cis-regulatory elements which will be useful to express agronomically significant genes in these tissues and/or other tissues. The ESTs of the present invention also can enable the acquisition of molecular markers, which can be used in, including but not limited to, breeding schemes, genetic and molecular mapping, and cloning of agronomically significant genes. Libraries from this tissue can enable the acquisition of a variety of agronomically significant genes involved in the synthesis and catabolism of commercially important traits.

Art Unit: 1634

Nucleic acid molecules and fragments thereof of the present invention may be employed to obtain other nucleic acid molecules. Such molecules include the nucleic acid molecules of other plants or other organisms (e.g., alfalfa, rice, potato, cotton, oat, rye, barley, maize, wheat, *Arabidopsis*, *Brassica*, etc.) including the nucleic acid molecules that encode, in whole or in part, protein homologues of other plant species or other organisms, and sequences of genetic elements such as promoters and transcriptional regulatory elements. Such molecules can be readily obtained by using the above-described nucleic acid molecules or fragments thereof to screen cDNA or genomic libraries obtained from such plant species. Methods for forming such libraries are well known in the art. Such homologue molecules may differ in their nucleotide sequences from those found in one or more of SEQ ID NO:1 through SEQ ID NO:6041 or complements thereof because complete complementarity is not needed for stable hybridization. The nucleic acid molecules of the present invention therefore also include molecules that, although capable of specifically hybridizing with the nucleic acid molecules may lack "complete complementarity."

14. It is noted that the instant disclosure was filed with 6041 different sequences. The specification has not identified which sequence has which utility. While agreement is reached in that the specification has provided a litany of possible utilities, such listing of any and all possible utilities effectively obscures just what the specific and credible utility, if any, the elected sequence, SEQ ID NO: 1, has and was recognized as having at the time of filing.

15. A review of the disclosure and of applicant's representative remarks fails to locate where any specific and credible utility has been associated with the specific sequence elected by applicant. While forward-looking statements may well be motivating to the skilled artisans in identifying what utility, if any, the claimed sequence has, such utility must exist in currently available form. It matters not whether the claim is drawn to a product or process; the claim must be drawn to an invention that satisfies the utility requirements as set forth under 35 USC 101 and as further developed in the Utility Guidelines. In support of this position, attention is directed to *Brenner, Comr. Pats. v. Manson*, 148 USPQ 689 (US SupCt 1966):

Whatever weight is attached to the value of encouraging disclosure and of inhibiting secrecy, we believe a more compelling consideration is that a process

Art Unit: 1634

patent in the chemical field, which has not been developed and pointed to the degree of specific utility, creates a monopoly of knowledge which should be granted only if clearly commanded by the statute. Until the process claim has been reduced to production of **a product shown to be useful**, the metes and bounds of that monopoly are not capable of precise delineation. It may engross a vast, unknown, and perhaps unknowable area. Such a patent may confer power to block off whole areas of scientific development, 22 without compensating benefit to the public. The basic quid pro quo contemplated by the Constitution and the Congress for granting a patent monopoly is the benefit derived by the public from an invention with substantial utility. Unless and until a process is refined and developed to this point-where specific benefit exists in currently available form-there is insufficient justification for permitting an applicant to engross what may prove to be a broad field.

* * *

We find absolutely no warrant for the proposition that although Congress intended that no patent be granted on a chemical compound whose sole "utility" consists of its potential role as an object of use-testing, a different set of rules was meant to apply to the process which yielded the unpatentable product. 24 That proposition seems to us little more than an attempt to evade the impact of the rules which concededly govern patentability of the product itself. This is not to say that we mean to disparage the importance of contributions to the fund of scientific information short of the invention of something "useful," or that we are blind to the prospect that what now seems without "use" may tomorrow command the grateful attention of the public. But a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion.

Here, there is absolutely no evidence of record that shows the claimed sequence has a specific, credible, and substantial utility. Therefore, and in the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary, the rejections are maintained.

16. Claims 1 and 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed

Art Unit: 1634

invention. Attention is directed to the decision in *University of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co.*

68 USPQ2D 1424 (Fed. Cir. 2004) at 1428:

To satisfy the written-description requirement, the specification must describe every element of the claimed invention in sufficient detail so that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the inventor possessed the claimed invention at the time of filing. *Vas-Cath*, 935 F.3d at 1563; see also *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572 [41 USPQ2d 1961] (Fed. Cir. 1997) (patent specification must describe an invention and do so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can clearly conclude that “the inventor invented the claimed invention”); *In re Gosteli*, 872 F.2d 1008, 1012 [10 USPQ2d 1614] (Fed. Cir. 1989) (“the description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [the inventor] invented what is claimed”). Thus, an applicant complies with the written-description requirement “by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious,” and by using “such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention.” *Lockwood*, 107 F.3d at 1572.

17. Claims 1 and 9-15 encompass sequences that are less than full-length cDNA. None of these sequences meet the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. The specification provides insufficient written description to support the genus encompassed by the claim. Further, the specification has not provided an adequate written description of those sequences in their possession and which have utility such that a skilled artisan would be able to readily differentiate between those that have utility and those that do not have utility.

18. *Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that “applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the ‘written description’ inquiry, whatever is now claimed.” (See page 1117.) The specification does not “clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed.” (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116.)

Art Unit: 1634

19. The skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed polynucleotides, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. The nucleic acid itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993), and *Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016. In *Fiddes v. Baird*, 30 USPQ2d 1481, 1483, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found unpatentable due to lack of written description for the broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

20. Finally, *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.*, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404, 1405 held that:

To fulfill the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe an invention and do so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can clearly conclude that "the inventor invented the claimed invention." *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (1997); *In re Gosteli*, 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989) ("[T]he description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [the inventor] invented what is claimed."). Thus, an applicant complies with the written description requirement "by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious," and by using "such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention." *Lockwood*, 107 F.3d at 1572, 41 USPQ2d at 1966.

An adequate written description of a DNA, such as the cDNA of the recombinant plasmids and microorganisms of the '525 patent, "requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties," not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention. *Fiers v. Revel*, 984 F.2d 1164, 1171, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Accordingly, "an adequate written description of a DNA requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it; what is required is a description of the DNA itself." *Id.* at 1170, 25 USPQ2d at 1606.

21. Accordingly, claims 1 and 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Response to argument

22. At page 12, bridging to page 13 of the response argument is presented that those of skill in the art can readily envision the alternative embodiments.

Art Unit: 1634

23. At page 13 agreement is reached in that possession of a genus can be demonstrated by a showing of a representative number of examples. Here applicant is claiming not just SEQ ID NO: 1, but "fragment thereof," and complements to same as well as sequences that have mutants. Said claims have also been interpreted as encompassing sequences of virtually any upper value in length in which the claimed sequence, fragment, complement, etc., is embedded. A review of the disclosure, and of applicant's representative's remarks, fails to locate where other examples of the genus of claimed nucleic acids has been provided, yet the claims encompass virtually an infinite number of nucleic acid molecules. Such limited disclosure does not provide an adequate written description of the genus of compounds now claimed. In support of this position, attention is directed to the decision in *In re Shokal*, 113 USPQ 283 (CCPA 1957) wherein is stated:

It appears to be well settled that a single species can rarely, if ever, afford sufficient support for a generic claim. *In re Soll*, 25 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 1309, 97 F.2d 623, 38 USPQ 189; *In re Wahlforss et al.*, 28 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 867, 117 F.2d 270, 48 USPQ 397. The decisions do not however fix any definite number of species which will establish completion of a generic invention and it seems evident therefrom that such number will vary, depending on the circumstances of particular cases. Thus, in the case of small genus such as the halogens, consisting of four species, a reduction to practice of three, or perhaps even two, might serve to complete the generic invention, while in the case of a genus comprising hundreds of species, a considerably larger number of reductions to practice would probably be necessary.

We are of the opinion that a genus containing such a large number of species cannot properly be identified by the mere recitation or reduction to practice of four or five of them. As was pointed out by the examiner, four species might be held to support a genus, if such genus is disclosed in clear language; but where those species must be relied on not only to illustrate the genus but to define what it is, the situation is otherwise.

Therefore, and in the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary, the rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

24. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

25. Claims 1 and 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Life Technologies.

26. Life Technologies (Gibco BRL products & Reference Guide) disclose for sale at page 17-19 random primers that are primarily hexanucleotides. The population of hexamers is considered to have as an inherent property nucleic acid sequences that would encode at least two amino acids that are also encoded by SEQ ID NO: 1.

Response to argument

27. At page 14 of the response applicant's representative asserts that the rejection should be withdrawn as the claim has been improperly interpreted as encompassing a fragment of SEQ ID NO: 1. For convenience, claim 1, as presently amended, is reproduced below.

1. (Currently amended) A substantially purified nucleic acid molecule that encodes a lily protein or fragment thereof comprising a nucleic acid sequence ~~selected from the group consisting of SEQ ID NO: 1 through SEQ ID NO: 6041.~~

28. For purposes of examination, claim 1 has been interpreted as encompassing any nucleic acid that comprises "a nucleic acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 1." The aspect of it being "a nucleic acid sequence" has been interpreted as encompassing any two bases as well as the full length of SEQ ID NO: 1 for "a sequence of SEQ ID NO: 1" is not the same as "SEQ ID NO: 1." Accordingly, the aspect of what constitutes "a sequence" of the larger has been given its broadest

Art Unit: 1634

possible interpretation, which has been any two nucleotides that do not have to be immediately adjacent to one another, yet are in the same general order or sequence, and which can have virtually any number and combination of added nucleotides. Given such interpretation, the rejection is proper and has been maintained and has also been applied against newly added claims 9-15.

Conclusion

29. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


30. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

31. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley L. Sisson whose telephone number is (571) 272-0751. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Thursday.

Art Unit: 1634

32. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, W. Gary Jones can be reached on (571) 272-0745. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

33. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Bradley L. Sisson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1634

BLS
14 June 2005